

Customer No. 24498  
Serial No. 10/566,393

PATENT  
PU030228

**Amendments to the Drawings**

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to Figure 3. This sheet replaces the original sheet, and corrects the errors pointed out by the Examiner.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet 2

**Remarks**

The Examiner has indicated that the Applicant must submit a translation of the priority document in order to perfect a claim foreign priority. The Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider such requirement, since the priority document is a US provisional application in the English language.

The Examiner has objected to Figure 3 of the drawing because of the presence of the term SSID. As suggested by the Examiner, the drawing has been amended to use the term SID.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract because it contains more than 150 words. The replacement Abstract submitted herewith contains less than 150 words.

The Examiner's objection to the specification has been overcome by amending the drawing to use the designation contained in the specification.

The active Claims in this application are 1 to 13, 25 to 34, 36, and 41 to 57.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 48 to 57 under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by US patent 5,708,780 to Levergood et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection.

Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“generating a web page including embedded data”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 48. The Examiner has referred to column 3, lines 53 and 54. However nowhere does this portion of the reference teach or suggest a web page. Rather, this portion of the reference discusses a protection domain. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 48 is not affected by Levergood et al.

Claims 49 and 50 are dependent from Claim 48 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 48.

Similarly nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“means for generating a web page including embedded data”,

as specifically recited in Claim 51. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 51 is not affected by Levergood et al.

Claims 52 and 53 are dependent from Claim 51 and added further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 51.

Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“transmitting authentication input page requesting authentication information”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 54. Rather, column 6, lines 44 to 49, which has been pointed out by the Examiner, discusses a procedure for checking credentials. It is therefore clear that Levergood et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 54.

Claim 55 is dependent from Claim 54 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that this subclaim is patentable as its parent Claim 54.

Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“means for transmitting authentication input page requesting authentication information”,

as specifically set for in Claim 56. Rather, column 6, lines 44 to 49 of Levergood et al, which has been pointed out by the Examiner, discusses a procedure for authenticating credentials. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 56 is not affected by Levergood et al.

Claim 57 is dependent from Claim 56 and adds further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that Claim 57 is patentable as its parent Claim 56.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 to 13, 34, 36 and 41 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Levergood et al in view of US Patent 6,732,176 to Stewart et al and WO 02/39237 to Hinton et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection.

Levergood et al does not control access to a network. Rather, Levergood et al discloses control of access to a file within a network. Levergood et al is not concerned with how a user obtains access to a network. See column 3, lines 18 to 20.

Stewart et al. shows a network 130 which has multiple access points, and feeds multiple network providers, so that a user may access the network using any one of a plurality of providers. The network may include a memory medium which stores a list of ID information which maps to a list of network providers. However nowhere does Stewart et al show or suggest:

“associating said unique data and said client identifier”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1. It is therefore clear that the patentability of Claim 1 is not affected by Stewart et al. Furthermore, nowhere does Hinton et al show or suggest:

“generating a web page by a local server requesting that said client select an authentication server and including said unique data and forwarding said generated webpage to said client”,

as specifically recited in Claim 1. Rather, Hinton et al generate a hyperlink, as explained on page 23, lines 18 to 19. It is therefore clear that even if the disclosures of Levergood et al, Stewart et al and Hinton et al were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 1 would not be affected.

Claims 2 to 13, 34, 36 and 41 are dependent from Claim 1 and add further advantageous features. I submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 1.

Claims 25, 27 to 32, and 42 to 47 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Levergood et al in view of Stewart et al. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider this rejection.

Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“A system for controlling access to a network”,

as specifically set forth in Claim 25. Rather, Levergood et al controls access to a file within a network. Levergood et al is not concerned with access to a network. Stewart et al neither shows nor suggests:

“the AP, in response to a redirected request to access the network from the client, associates unique data with an identifier of the client and stores a mapping of the association”.

Rather, in Stewart et al, the AP either listens for identification information, or broadcasts requests for identification information. See column 2, lines 42 to 48. It is therefore clear that even if the disclosures of Levergood et al and Stewart et al were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 25 would not be affected.

Claims 26 to 33 are dependent from Claim 25 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 25.

With regard to Claim 42, Levergood et al does not control network access. Rather, Levergood et al controls access to a file within a network. Furthermore, Levergood et al does not receive a request for network access. Rather, Levergood et al receives a request for access to a file within a network. It is therefore clear that Levergood et al does not affect the patentability of Claim 42.

Claims 43 and 44 are dependent from Claim 42 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 42.

Similarly, Claim 45 recites a system for controlling network access. Nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest this structure. Rather, Levergood et al shows a system for controlling access to a file within a network. It therefore follows that nowhere does Levergood et al show or suggest:

“means for granting network access ..... and means to deny network access”,

as specifically recited in Claim 45. Rather than grant or deny network access, Levergood et al grants or denies access to a file within a network.

The Examiner has asserted that Levergood et al and Stewart et al are analogous because both teach access control to a network or the Internet via a wire or wirelessly. The Applicant can not agree. Levergood et al does not teach access control to a network, but rather only shows access control of a file within a network. It is therefore clear that the Examiner's proposed combination of Levergood et al and Stewart et al is improper.

Claims 46 and 47 are dependent from Claim 45 and add further advantageous features. The Applicant submits that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 45.

On 12 January 2009, the Examiner indicated to the applicant's attorney that there is no prior art made of record and not relied upon, as set forth in paragraph 13 of the Office communication.

The Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

No fee is believed to have been incurred by virtue of this response, except for the fee for the extension of time for response to the open Office Communication. However if a fee is incurred on the basis of this response, please charge such fee against Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,  
Junbiao Zhang

by /Daniel E. Sragow/  
Daniel E. Sragow  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 22,856  
609/734-6832

THOMSON Licensing Inc.  
Patent Operation  
PO Box 5312  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: 14 January 2009